



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,385	01/13/2000	Li-Wen Chen	HHPI-01000US1	8308
23910	7590	02/23/2007	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 CALIFORNIA STREET 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108			COLBERT, ELLA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3694	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/483,385	CHEN, LI-WEN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ella Colbert	3694

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6, 40, 41 and 44 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-6, 40, 41, and 44 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6, 40, 41, and 44 are pending in this communication filed 12/04/06 entered as Response to Ex Parte Quayle Action.
2. The Ex Parte Quayle Action is hereby withdrawn in view of the rejection as set forth here below.

Specification

3. The Specification is objected to because the Specification in the section entitled "CROSS-REFERENCES TO RELATED APPLICATIONS" needs to have the attorney docket numbers deleted for each of the applications and state whether the application is still pending or the patent number or abandoned. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-6, 40, 41, and 44 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-6, 40, 41, 47-51, and 57-61 of copending

Application No. 09/483,182. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have been allowed but not yet been given a patent number and the application is still pending.

6. The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application 09/483,182 and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: creating a multi dimensional report from information in a database, receiving a definition of a customer profile, receiving from a user input indicating a report configuration selection, creating a first dimension table, creating a fact table, and aggregating business performance measures according to a customer profile hierarchy.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

The co-pending Application '182 claims 1-1-6, 40, 41, 47-51, and 57-61 claim a apparatus, a computer implemented method, and a computer readable medium and the instant Application '385 claims 1-6, 40, 41, and 44 claim a method for performing the steps of receiving a definition of a reverse star schema meta-model, generating a data warehouse, receiving a definition for a data model, dynamically creating at least one generated database, and displaying at least a portion of the dynamically generated

database. The claim limitations in the '182 co-pending application is substantially the same as the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 6,377,993) Brandt et al, hereafter Brandt (US 5,799,286) in view of (US 6,212,524) Weissman et al, hereafter Weissman.

With respect to claim 1, Brandt discloses, receiving a definition for a reverse star schema meta- model (col. 19, lines 52-67 and col. 20, lines 1-18); generating a data warehouse populated with the information from the source database and in accordance with the meta-model; receiving a definition of at least one of a plurality of customer profile groups; receiving input indicating a quantity of interest in the information; receiving a definition for a data model and dynamically creating at least one generated database based upon the data warehouse and the data model and configured to the quantity of interest further comprising: creating at least one first dimension table based upon the data schema and the quantity of interest; and creating at least one fact table based upon the data schema and the quantity of interest and the information (col. 3, lines 48-61, col. 20, lines 19-67, and col. 21, lines 1-17).

Brandt failed to disclose, displaying at least a portion of the dynamically generated database.

Weissman discloses, displaying at least a portion of the dynamically generated database (col. 15, lines 8-14, col. 26, lines 25-42 and col. 37, lines 11-16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have display at least a portion of the dynamically generated database and to modify in Brandt because such a modification would allow Brandt to have a datamart that is in a star schema associated with a dimension table stored in a database that can be displayed to a user.

Claim 44 is rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claim 1.

9. Claims 2-4, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 6,377,993) Brandt et al, hereafter Brandt (US 5,799,286) in view of (US 6,212,524) Weissman et al, hereafter Weissman and further in view of Morgan et al, hereafter Morgan.

With respect to claim 2, Brandt and Weissman failed to disclose, generating a customer profile report and wherein the information comprises business performance measures and wherein: creating at least one first dimension table further comprises: creating a customer profile hierarchy from the customer profile groups; and creating at least one fact table further comprises: aggregating said business performance measures according to said customer profile hierarchy. Morgan discloses, generating a customer profile report and wherein the information comprises business performance measures (col. 7, lines 40-56, col. 9, lines 1-22, fig. 8 &fig. 18B), and wherein: creating

at least one first dimension table further comprises: creating a customer profile hierarchy from the customer profile groups; and creating at least one fact table further comprises: aggregating said business performance measures according to said customer profile hierarchy (col. 5, lines 36-63).

With respect to claims 3, Brandt and Weissman failed to disclose, generating an operation report, and wherein the information comprises business performance measures. Morgan discloses, generating an operation report and wherein the information comprises business performance measures (col. 7, lines 40-56, col. 9, lines 1-22, and fig. 8 & fig. 18B).

Brandt failed to disclose, creating at least one fact table comprises: aggregating said business performance measures according to said customer profile hierarchy and filtering said customer profiles.

Weissman discloses, creating at least one fact table further comprises: aggregating said business performance measures according to said customer profile hierarchy and filtering said customer profiles (col. 15, lines 8-14 and lines 34-65 and col. 26, lines 25-42). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have create at least one fact table further comprising: aggregating said business performance measures according to said customer profile hierarchy and to filter said customer profiles and to modify in Brandt because such a modification would allow Brandt to have the fact table key point to the fact table and the aggregate group to define a set of aggregates to be built for a constellation.

With respect to claim 4, Brandt failed to disclose, creating at least one first dimension table further comprises: creating at least one of a plurality of customer profiling dimensions based upon the at least one of a plurality of customer profile groups received; and creating at least one fact table further comprises: aggregating customer records based on at least one of a plurality of customer profiling dimensions.

Weissman discloses, creating at least one first dimension table (col. 14, lines 9-67, col. 15, lines 8-14 and col. 26, lines 25-42) further comprises: creating at least one of a plurality of customer profiling dimensions based upon the at least one of a plurality of customer profile groups received and creating at least one fact table further comprises: aggregating customer records based on at least one of a plurality of customer profiling dimensions (col. 7, lines 64-67, col. 8, lines 1-25, and col. 10, lines 24-42). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to creating at least one first dimension table further comprises: create at least one of a plurality of customer profiling dimensions based upon the at least one of a plurality of customer profile groups; and create at least one fact table. further comprises: aggregating customer records based on at least one of a plurality of customer profiling dimensions and to modify in Brandt because such a modification would allow Brandt to have special dimensions to indicate whether or not the dimension columns can be created and to have a map key that indicates the mapping group to use.

With respect to claim 40, Brandt failed to disclose, receiving a selection of targeted customer segment of interest as the quantity of interest. Morgan teaches,

receiving a selection of targeted customer segment of interest as the quantity of interest (col. 8, lines 32-66 and col. 9, lines 1-25).

Brandt discloses, generating at least one of a plurality of target customer segment tables based upon the dynamically generated database (col. 3, lines 48-61, col. 20, lines 19-67, col. 21, lines 1-17).

Brandt and Morgan failed to disclose, providing the targeted customer segment tables to external applications.

Wiessman discloses, providing the targeted customer segment tables to external applications (col. 14, lines 9-67, col. 15, lines 1-14, and col. 26, lines 5-42). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate at least one of a plurality of target customer segment tables based upon the dynamically generated database and to modify in Brandt because such a modification would allow Brandt to have people module computations in a table for configuration planning.

With respect to claim 41, Brandt failed to disclose, receiving an input from an on-line application processor (OLAP); transforming the input into a database query based upon the data model; and providing information in response to the database query. Weissman discloses, receiving an input from an on-line application processor (OLAP) (col. 9, lines 48-60); transforming the input into a database query based upon the data model; and providing information in response to the database query (col. 10, lines 5-13). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive an input from an on-line application processor (OLAP);

transform the input into a database query based upon the data model; and provide information in response to the database query and to modify in Brandt because such a modification would allow Brandt to support the query that provides high level information about a business and provides an improved schema for querying data.

10. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt, Weissman, and Morgan in view of (US 5,615,109) Eder.

With respect to claim 5, Brandt and Morgan failed to disclose, creating a list of customers for each one of the plurality of customer profile groups; creating at least one intermediary data structure to manage the list of customers; and creating customer classification components in a meta model for each customer profile group.

Weissman discloses, creating a list of customers for each one of the plurality of customer profile groups (col. 12, lines 63-67, col.13, lines 1-11, col. 35, lines 5-12 and col. 35, lines 30-54, and figs. 8-10) and creating at least one intermediary data structure to manage the list of customers (col. 34, lines 33-63).

Brandt, Weissman, and Morgan failed to disclose, creating customer classification components in a meta model for each customer profile group.

Eder discloses, creating customer classification components in a meta model for each customer profile group (col. 13, lines 1-20- shows a meta model for each profile group). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create customer classification components in a meta model for each customer profile group and to modify in Brandt because such a modification would

allow Brandt to show a measure for the firm's financial performance during prior periods when data input has been completed.

With respect to claim 6, Brandt discloses, wherein said information comprises at least one of telecommunications information, financial information, retail marketing information, insurance information, and healthcare information (col. 5, lines 56-61, col. 18, lines 6-35, and col. 6, lines 7-9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,799,286) Morgan et al, hereafter Morgan in view of (US 6,377,993) Brandt et al, Brandt and further in view of (US 6,212,524) Weissman et al, hereafter Weissman

With respect to claim 40, Morgan teaches, receiving a selection of targeted customer segment of interest as the quantity of interest (col. 8, lines 32-66 and col. 9, lines 1-25).

Morgan did not teach, generating at least one of a plurality of target customer segment tables based upon the dynamically generated database.

Brandt discloses, generating at least one of a plurality of target customer segment tables based upon the dynamically generated database (col. 3, lines 48-61, col. 20, lines 19-67, col. 21, lines 1-17).

Morgan and Brandt did not teach, providing the targeted customer segment tables to external applications.

Wiessman teaches, providing the targeted customer segment tables to external applications (col. 14, lines 9-67, col. 15, lines 1-14, and col. 26, lines 5-42). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate at least one of a plurality of target customer segment tables based upon the dynamically generated database and to modify in Morgan because such a modification would allow Morgan to have people module computations in a table for configuration planning.

Weissman and Morgan did not teach, generating at least one of a plurality of target customer segment tables based upon the dynamically generated database. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate at least one of a plurality of target customer segment tables based upon the dynamically generated database have a state schema model including a fact table joined by a number of attendant tables known as dimensions.

With respect to claim 41, Weissman teaches, receiving an input from an on-line application processor (OLAP) (col. 9, lines 48-60); transforming the input into a database query based upon the data model; and providing information in response to the database query (col. 10, lines 5-13).

Inquiries

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 571-272-6741. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday, 5:30AM-3:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

February 19, 2007



ELLA COLBERT
PRIMARY EXAMINER